



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,319	10/19/2001	Ravi Narayanan	O&L 1000-1070	4118

7590 11/16/2005
KERMIT D. LOPEZ / LUIS M. ORTIZ
ORTIZ & LOPEZ PLLC
P.O. BOX 4484
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87196-4484

EXAMINER

DOAN, DUYEN MY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,319

Applicant(s)

NARAYANAN ET AL.

Examiner

Duyen M. Doan

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-17 and 20-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-17 and 20-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detail Action

Claims 1-32 are amended for examination.

Claims 2-3, 18-19 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-13, 16-17, 20-29, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Artsy (us pat 5,701,484) in view of Glass (us pat 6,442,586).

As regarding claim 1, Artsy disclosed designating an object which comprises a self-contained module of data and associated processing information (col.6, lines 11-34); and routing said object over said distributed computer network utilizing an object oriented router, which can parse said object and apply said associated processing information contained within said object (col.6, lines 11-67, nodes 10-13 are routing node).

Artsy did not expressly disclose permitting said object oriented router to become self-programmed for varying data formats; permitting said object oriented router to construct said object by dynamically downloading said associated processing information corresponding to data

Art Unit: 2143

received from an external data source.

Glass taught permitting said object oriented router to become self-programmed for varying data formats (Glass col.1, lines 61-67, col.2, lines 1-7, lines 32-67); permitting said object oriented router to construct said object by dynamically downloading said associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source (Glass col.4, lines 24-59).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Glass to the method of Artsy to permit said object oriented router to become self-programmed for varying data formats; permitting said object oriented router to construct said object by dynamically downloading said associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because both inventions of Artsy and Glass taught routing objects in an object oriented environment.

A person with an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Glass to the method of Artsy to permit said object oriented router to become self-programmed for varying data formats; permitting said object oriented router to construct said object by dynamically downloading said associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because by having the object oriented router to become self-programmed for varying data format and construct object by downloading associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source would allow object to move around the network with different computer platform (see Glass col.1, lines 62-67).

As regarding claim 4, Artsy-Glass disclosed constructing said object utilizing an end device by packaging said data and said associated processing information; and transmitting said object to said object oriented router (see Glass col.4, lines 24-59). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 4.

As regarding claim 5, Artsy-Glass disclosed routing said data and said associated processing information utilizing an object oriented router, such that said data and said associated processing information may be utilized by a subsequent object oriented router to continue routing said data further through said distributed computer network (Artsy col.6, lines 11-59).

As regarding claim 6, Artsy-Glass disclosed said subsequent object router comprises a next-hop object router (see Artsy col.10, lines 28-31, next stop node).

As regarding claim 7, Artsy-Glass disclosed downloading other associated processing information utilizing a received object; and thereafter constructing a new object (see Glass col.4, lines 24-55). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 7.

As regarding claim 8, Artsy-Glass disclosed object oriented router can utilize said data or said associated processing information embedded in said object to download said other set of associated processing information (see Glass col.4, lines 24-59). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 8.

As regarding claim 9, Artsy-Glass disclosed object oriented router can utilize said data or said associated processing information embedded in said object to download said other set of associated processing information to augment current associated processing information (see Glass col.4, lines 24-59). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 9.

As regarding claim 10, Artsy-Glass disclosed said object oriented router can utilize said data or said associated processing information embedded in said object to download said other set of associated processing information to replace said current associated processing information (see Glass col.4, lines 24-59). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 10.

As regarding claim 11, Artsy-Glass disclosed associated processing information comprises at least one software method (see Glass col.4, lines 24-59, constructor, argument). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 11.

As regarding claim 12, Artsy-Glass disclosed at least one software method is present within said object (see Glass col.4, lines 24-59, constructor, argument). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 12.

As regarding claim 13, Artsy-Glass disclosed at least one software method is associated with said object (see Glass col.4, lines 24-59). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 13.

As regarding claim 16, the limitations are similar to claims 3-7 therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 3-7.

As regarding claim 17, the limitations are similar to claim 1, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claim 1.

As regarding claims 20-29, the limitations are similar to claims 4-13, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claims 4-13.

As regarding claim 32, the limitations are similar to claim 16, therefore rejected for the same rationales as claims 16.

Claims 14-15, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Artsy (us pat 5,701,484) and Glass (us pat 6,442,586) as applied to claims 1,17 further in view of Martin et al (us pat 6,061,562) (hereinafter Martin).

As regarding claim 14, Artsy and Glass disclosed all limitations in claim 1, but the combination of Artsy and Glass did not expressly disclose object oriented router can route proprietary data.

Marting taught object oriented router can route proprietary data (col.6, lines 35-38, the gateway route data in either standard or proprietary protocol).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Martin to the method of Artsy-Glass to have object oriented router route proprietary data because routing the proprietary data in a networking environment is a well known method.

As regarding claim 15, Artsy-Glass-Martin disclosed object oriented router can route standard data (see Martin col.6, lines 35-38, the gateway route data in either standard or proprietary protocol).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Martin to the method of Artsy-Glass to have object oriented router route proprietary data because routing the proprietary data in a networking environment is a well known method.

As regarding claim 30, the limitations are similar to claim 14, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 14.

As regarding claim 31, the limitations are similar to claim 14, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 15.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remark (pg.8 to pg.24), filed August 17, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-32 under Hind, Gupner, Hossain have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Artsy, Glass and Martin.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner
Duyen Doan
Art unit 2143



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100